SOME NEW BOOKS.

Was St. Peter Bishop of Rome?

Not only German Rationalists but also most Protestant historians, including those who are inclined to admit that St. Peter may have sojourned in the capital of the Cæsars, and perhaps have shared Paul's martyrdom, are unanimous in denying that he was ever Bishop of Rome. They treat the contrary assumption as a myth, and indeed have pretty well convinced the majority of cultivated English and American readers that the subject does not deserve serious discussion. *Audi alteram partem* is the demand now made upon them in a work remarkable for erudition and controversial ability—*St. Peter, Bishop of Rome*, by the Rev. T. Livius of Oriel College, Oxford (Catholic Publication Society). The evidence adduced for the reality of St. Peter's episcopate is partly historical and partly archæological. So far as the proofs are derived from written history, the book is to a large extent based upon Prof. Jungmann's dissertation on the same subject, which, although published as late as 1880, is already known at least by repute to most students of primitive Christianity. So far, on the other hand, as the testimony to St. Peter's episcopal office is drawn from monuments, inscriptions, and wall paintings, the author acknowledges considerable obligations to the "Roma Sotterranea" of Northcote and Brownlow. But he has added a great deal of his own, and, altogether, has made a book which deserves careful attention on the part of Anglican Protestants, who do not need to be reminded of the important bearing of the author's affirmance on the foundations of their Church. We should add that in respect of literary qualities, such as effective arrangement and correct and lucid diction, this essay by an English Catholic scholar is not unworthy of Cardinal Newman, to whom it is dedicated. It will be remembered that the Cardinal was in his younger days a tutor and distinguished ornament of Oriel, the college of which the author of the book before us is a graduate.

Beginning with the evidence from history proper, let us see primarily what reason there is for believing that St. Peter ever visited Rome, and also from time to time consider the proofs of his episcopate. Unquestionably the New Testament is silent on the matter, and great stress has been laid on the absence of allusions to it by Luke and Paul. We follow the plan adopted by the author who first brings forward testimony from an age somewhat remote from that of Peter, and then corroborates this with testimony more nearly contemporary. His first witness, however, is drawn from the fourth century, since it is admitted by Dean Milman that "at the commencement of the fifth century the lineal descent of the Pope from St. Peter was an accredited tenet of Christianity." The following quotation is from St. John Chrysostom, who, as a native of Antioch and Patriarch of Constantinople (*circa* A. D. 387), might be expected, owing to the rivalry between the Eastern and the Western Churches, to accept only upon cogent evidence a fact which involved the primacy of the Bishop of Rome. "After having," he says, "had him [St. Peter] as our teacher, we [Antiochenes] did not keep him, but surrendered him to imperial Rome." Again, in a eulogy of Rome, he says: "Thence shall Paul be caught up; thence Peter. Think and tremble at the sight which Rome shall see—Paul raised of a sudden from that deposit with Peter, and borne up to meet the Lord." About the same time (A. D. 390) St. Jerome, author or reviser of the (Vulgate) Latin translation of the Bible, wrote in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers: "Simon Peter, brother of Andrew the Apostle, himself Prince of the Apostles, after being Bishop of the Church of Antioch, and preaching to those of the circumcision who believed, proceeded in the second year of Claudius to Rome to confound Simon Magus; and there held for twenty-five years the sacerdotal see until the last year of Nero, by whom he was crowned with martyrdom, being crucified with his head downwards, saying that he was not worthy to be crucified as his Lord was. He was buried at Rome in the Vatican, near the Triumphal Way." Next we come sixty-five years nearer Peter, to Eusebius, who, in his Chronicon, writing of the second year of the Emperor Claudius, says: "Peter the Apostle, Galilæan by birth, the first Pontiff of Christians, having first founded the Church at Antioch, goes to Rome, and, there preaching the Gospel, for twenty-five years continued Bishop of that city." Then, coming to the thirteenth year of Nero, he writes: "Nero was the first to raise a persecution against the Christians, in which Peter and Paul suffered a glorious death in Rome." So, too, in his Ecclesiastical History the same author writes apropos of the Neronian persecution: "It is related, therefore, that Paul was beheaded in Rome and Peter crucified under him. This account is attested by the fact that the titles of Peter and Paul still remain in the cemeteries of that city even to this day." Later on Eusebius thus refers to Peter's coming to Rome: "Immediately (*i. e.*, after the arrival of Simon Magus, previously related) under the reign of Claudius, Peter, that powerful and great Apostle, was conducted to Rome against this pest of mankind." An attempt, indeed, has been made to discredit this testimony by the fact that we do not possess the original Greek text of the Chronicon of Eusebius, but only a Latin paraphrase executed by St. Jerome. Mr. Livius meets this objection by quoting the following transcript of the passage in question from an Armenian version of the Chronicon which has been discovered and published during the present century: "The Apostle Peter, having first founded the Church at Antioch, goes to the city of the Romans, and there preaches the Gospel, and remains Bishop of the Church there twenty years." It is true that this Armenian version differs from Jerome's pharaphrase as regards the duration of Peter's stay in Rome and is silent about his martyrdom. But, so far as it goes, it is confirmatory. Besides, we have the original text of the Ecclesiastical History, the value of whose testimony cannot be impugned by any dispute about the chronicle. It should also be noted that Chrysostom, Jerome, and Eusebius are not the only witnesses that might be called from the fourth century. Their evidence is confirmed by that of St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, Athanasius, Lactantius, Orosius, and others. Even in the Office for Peter and Paul, which is thought to date from the fourth century, the preaching and martyrdom at Rome of those two Apostles form the subject of thanksgiving and praise. So far, there seems to be a consensus on the part of the Eastern and Western Churches, of the orthodox and the schismatics.

We come next to the third century. About the middle of it we find St. Cyprian testifying to a received opinion that St. Peter had been the Bishop of Rome. He says: "Cornelius was made Bishop by very many of our colleagues then present in the city of Rome, when the place of Fabian—that is, when the place of Peter and the sacerdotal chair—was vacant." Origen (A. D. 216), in his Commentaries on Genesis, made (according to Eusebius) the following statement: "Peter is held to have preached through Pontus, Galatia, Bythinia, Cappadocia and Asia to the Jews that were scattered abroad, who also, finally being in Rome, was crucified with his head downward, having himself requested to suffer in this way." In Tertullian (A. D. 195) occur these references to Peter's experiences at Rome: "There is no distinction between those whom John bathed in the Jordan and Peter in the Tiber." Again: "Peter and Paul left to the Romans the Gospel sealed also with their blood." Elsewhere: "We read the lives of the Cæsars. Nero first stained with blood the Eastern faith at Rome. Then Peter is girded with another when he is fastened to the cross." And finally: "If thou art near to Italy thou hast Rome * * * where Peter had a like passion with the Lord." To the third century (A. D. 214) also belongs the testimony of one Caius, who lived when Zephyrinus was Bishop of the Romans, and who (again according to Eusebius), "in a writing addressed to Proclus, a leader of the Phrygian sect, uses these words concerning the places where the bodies (earthly tabernacles) of the aforesaid Apostles are deposited: 'But I have it in my power to show the trophies of the Apostles, for if you will go to the Vatican, or to the Ostian Way, you will find the trophies of those who founded this Church.'" This passage has been the subject of much controversy, and it must be admitted that this testimony of Caius, like that of Origen above mentioned, rests on the exactness of the quotations of Eusebius, who believed in recording only what was edifying, and may not have considered literal accuracy essential.

From the second century (A. D. 178) the defenders of the Petrine tradition are able to bring forward Irenæus, who, it should be remembered, had known Polycarp, who in his own youth had seen St. John and been instructed by the Apostles. In an often-quoted passage he not only speaks of "the Church founded and constituted at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul," but traces the line of episcopal succession, step by step, down to his own time. In another passage (quoted by Eusebius) Irenæus says that Matthew produced his Gospel written among the Hebrews in their own dialect (that is, in the form of Aramaic, then current in Palestine), "whilst Peter and Paul proclaimed the Gospel and founded the Church at Rome." Eusebius also cites St. Dionysius, a Bishop of Corinth, and contemporary of Irenæus (A. D. 170), to the following effect: "So also you have again united the planting of the Romans and Corinthians, which was by the hands of Peter and Paul. For both came to our Corinth, and planting us, both alike taught; and alike going to Italy also and having taught together, they gave their testimony at the same time." Another witness from the same period is Clement of Alexandria, born about the middle of the second century. Still, according to Eusebius, Clement wrote as follows with regard to the order of the Gospels: "When Peter had proclaimed the word publicly at Rome and declared the Gospel under the influence of the Holy Spirit, as there were a great number present, they requested Mark, as one who had long followed him and remembered well what he had said, to reduce what had been preached by the Apostle to writing."

Lastly, we have a much-discussed passage in the Epistle to the Corinthians of St. Clement, who was Bishop of Rome in the first century, and who, according to Irenæus, was the third successor of St. Peter in that see. "Let us," he says, "set before our eyes, also, the good Apostles. Peter, through unjust jealousy, endured, not one nor two, but many painful toils, and, thus martyred, went to the due place of glory. Through jealousy, Paul, after having seven times borne chains, and having been banished and stoned, received the reward of patience, * * * and, having come to the boundary of the West and being martyred under the rulers, departed from the world and went to the holy place, having been the greatest example of patience." This chain of affirmative evidence is strengthened by some exegetical notes on texts of the New Testament by Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others, all of which take for granted the residence of Peter at Rome. As to the counter evidence furnished by the silence of Paul and Luke, it must be admitted that this is merely negative, and can be explained upon the theory that Peter's presence at Rome was a fact too well known to need explicit announcement. Implied allusions to it have been detected by some commentators.

Let us look now at the evidence supplied by the researches of the archæologists at Rome, and principally in the catacombs. We should premise that after the repeated devastation of Rome by the barbarians the bodies of the Christians buried in these crypts were gradually removed to other places of interment, so that the first half of the ninth century may be said to have ended the history of the catacombs as shrines or places of pilgrimage, just as the beginning of the fifth had ended their history as cemeteries. The effective rediscovery and opening of the catacombs took place in 1578, and the loss to Christian archæology in the course of the next century, owing to the reckless search for relics and the rude treatment of inscriptions and monuments, is incalculable. That what remains, however, casts some light on the relation of Peter to the See of Rome, the author endeavors to demonstrate in the second part of his book, which, as we have said, is largely founded on the "Roma Sotterranea." According to De Rossi, whose researches are embodied in the invaluable work just mentioned, there are, in the Roman subterranean sepulchres, amid Christian inscriptions and examples of Christian art, memorials of persons who appear to belong to the times of the Flavii and of Trajan. Indeed, precise dates pertaining to those periods have been discovered. Thus, in the seventeenth century, when extensive excavations were made round the so-called "Confession" of St. Peter, a marble sarcophagus was disclosed, which, in view of the character of its sculpture, the simplicity of its inscription, and the symbols engraved upon it, must be assigned to a very early age. It bore the single name of "Linus," who, according to Irenæus, succeeded St. Peter in the episcopate. Both for the reasons previously mentioned and because the name is of extremely rare occurrence on Christian monuments, De Rossi believes that this was the sepulchre of Peter's successor, who, according to an early ecclesiastical writer, was buried close to the Apostles. It is known that the crypts of the Vatican once formed a Christian cemetery, which, however, has been destroyed by the foundations of the vast basilica which now guards St. Peter's tomb. St. Paul is supposed to have been buried in a subterranean cemetery which lay under the site afterward covered by the basilica of St. Paul *extra muros*. The greater part of this catacomb also has been destroyed, but it is certain that Boldetti read in it the most ancient Christian inscription with a consular date that has come down to us. It was scratched on the mortar round one of the graves, and the consulate of *Sura et Senecio* marks the year A. D. 107. A second inscription was also found in the same place in marble, recording the names of *Piso et Bolenus*, Consuls A. D. 110. There was a third inscription which, although not dated, should, according to De Rossi, be referred to a still earlier age, namely, that of the Flavian Emperors. We come next to a cemetery known to Roman visitors as the catacomb of St. Agnes. Here is a crypt containing a large niche like a tribune, with leaves in stucco work. De Rossi pronounces it well ascertained that the ancient custom was to place the pontifical chair in such a tribune. He was consequently inclined to identify this crypt, which had been visited and described by Bosio, with that in which St. Peter's chair is recorded to have stood in the days of Gregory the Great (A. D. 600). The crypt has been rediscovered quite recently, and one of his pupils has attempted to decipher a few letters of an inscription on the tribune which had baffled Bosio 300 years ago. In front of the tribune stands a round pillar, such as in the most important crypts used to support a vase of perfumed oils. So far as this goes, it confirms the account of the Abbot John, who says that, when at Rome in the time of Gregory the Great, he obtained some oil from the chair where Peter the Apostle first sat. It should also be added that his definition of the place where the chair stood agrees with the situation of the so-called catacomb of St. Agnes. There is further evidence for the extreme antiquity of this catacomb, namely, the existence in it of a large number of epitaphs incised on marble. These bear no Christian symbol but the anchor and the fish, and have only one Christian acclamation, namely, the first that came into use, *vivas in Deo*. It is noteworthy that the family or rather *gens* names here recorded carry us back to the period between Nero and the first of the Antonines, *i. e.*, to the age of those who either heard the Apostles themselves or at least their first disciples. Of another cemetery, that of St. Sebastian, which stands on the Appian road, between two and three miles out of the city, it should be noted that its situation agrees with the written account of a visitor who came to Rome at some time between the years of 625 and 638. He says: "Afterwards you arrive by the Via Appia at St. Sebastian, martyr, whose body lies in a very low spot; and there are the sepulchres of the Apostles Peter and Paul, in which they rested forty years." The author's purpose in citing these and other facts about the catacombs is to show that much of the traditional history of early Roman Christianity can be substantiated, and thus to afford ground for presuming that much else which has been handed down and generally believed with regard to the first planting of Christianity in Rome is also historically trustworthy. The marshalling of such ancillary evidence is the more necessary because, as the author truly says, a report of the discovery of the sepulchral urn of Seneca or Nero would meet with more attention and more ready acceptance in Protestant countries than would a similar report touching some important relic of one of the Apostles, particularly if it bore on the existence of Peter's episcopate.

The testimony furnished by the gilded glasses, sculpture, and paintings found in the catacombs is next considered. Most of the gilded glasses found in the catacombs were evidently bottoms of drinking cups. They are referred by De Rossi to a period ranging from the second half of the third to the beginning of the fourth century. The inscriptions and designs on these glass cup bottoms are executed in gold leaf, and in such a way that the figures and letters may be seen from the inside as they are on the glass bottoms of the ale tankards used at English universities. The favorite subject on the glasses found in the catacombs is the representation of the two Apostles, Peter and Paul. St. Peter is generally in these pictures, placed at the right hand, but by no means always so. The inference that the two Apostles were at first regarded as equal and coördinate seems refuted by the fact that on one glass Christ himself is found standing on the left of Saint Paul. It is contended that the primacy of St. Peter is symbolically attested in other glasses, which present him under the type of Moses striking the rock. In two instances the figure is identified with St. Peter by the inscription of his name upon the side; one of these glasses is preserved in the Vatican. The same scene, in which the relation of St. Peter to Christianity is made analogous with that of Moses to Israel, is reproduced in the sculptures on Christian sarcophagi and in the wall paintings of the catacombs. Indeed, the rod, which is the emblem of divine power, is never found except in three hands, those of Moses, Christ, and Peter. It may also be mentioned that on a sarcophagus found in the crypt of St. Peter's and attributed by De Rossi to the time of Constantine, St. Peter is represented as receiving from Christ the book of the New Law, precisely as heathen magistrates were wont to receive from the Emperors the book of the Constitutions whereby they were to govern the province committed to their charge.

The so-called chair of St. Peter, still preserved in the Vatican basilica, is not the chair supposed to have stood in the Cemeterium Ostrianum, seen by the Abbot John A. D. 600, and believed to have occupied the crypt in the catacomb which now bears the name of Saint Agnes. This chair, which is still preserved in the Vatican, is, as visitors to Rome are well aware, enclosed within the bronze monument erected by Bernini. It was, however, uncovered twenty-one years ago by Pope Pius IX. and carefully inspected by De Rossi. In the oaken legs are fixed such iron rings as make the seat a *sella gestatoria*, like that which the Roman Senators began to use in the time of Claudius. From the sculptured bands of ivory with which the chair is overlaid some archæologists have inferred that it must have originally been an imperial throne of Byzantine manufacture. The author of this book tries to demonstrate that the oaken frame at all events must have come down from apostolic times, and was, in fact, identical with the Peter's chair referred to by Ennodius of Pavia at the end of the fifth century, and according to Bede, seen by Caedwalla toward the close of the seventh century; indeed, Mr. Livius believes it to be the chair mentioned in the Poem against Marcion ascribed to the third century, and which certainly suggests the idea not of a figurative, but of a material and well-known cathedra. A passage of Tertullian also seems to contemplate an actual chair, and the theory that such a relic was preserved at Rome is strengthened by the fact that the churches of Jerusalem and Alexandria are said to have respectively preserved and venerated the chairs of James and Mark.

The archæological indications of Peter's residence at Rome may not seem numerous or decisive, but they are combined with the testimony from written history in an exceedingly impressive, if not altogether convincing way, in a species of narrative mosaic, such as Becker has executed in his delineations of Greek and Roman life. They who wish to see summarized in an attractive form the results of the investigations which we have here tried to follow, may be referred to the fifth chapter of the second part of this book. For our own part, we must acknowledge the sense of astonishment with which we have inspected the mass of converging and cumulative evidence for the Catholic belief that St. Peter sojourned, suffered martyrdom, and exercised functions which we regard as episcopal, in the Eternal City.

M. W. H.

Old London.

They who like antiquarian chat about such details of local scenery and manners as help to give us the form and pressure of past times recall with pleasure Mr. John Ashton's "Social Life in the Reign of Queen Anne," and will be glad to see a new book by the same author, entitled *The Fleet, its River, Prison, and Marriages.* (Scribner & Welford.) It may seem at first sight a strange waste of the writer's industry and the publishers' resources to devote a volume of 400 large octavo pages to the short, narrow, shallow, and now buried affluent of the Thames, known to readers of last century's literature as "Fleet Ditch." But this petty, sluggish, and almost forgotten stream has a history of its own, stretching back as far as the reign of William the Conqueror, and recorded in public documents, histories, diaries, dramas, satires, and essays. Strange as the fact may appear to those who know it only as a sewer arched over throughout the greater part of its length, the Fleet was once a river of importance to commerce, and (as the frontispiece to this volume shows) its mouth was still a haven for small fishing smacks and boats as late as 1765. Thus, an act of Parliament passed in 1307 complained that, "whereas, in times past the course of water running at London under Oldebourne bridge and Fleete bridge into the Thames had been of such breadth and depth that ten or twelve ships, navies at once with merchandise, were wont to come to the foresaid bridge of Fleete and some of them to Oldebourne bridge, now (on the contrary) the same water course, by filth of the tanners and by raising of wharves, but specially by a diversion of the waters made by them of the new Temple, was sore decayed." The Lord Mayor was accordingly ordered to scour and deepen the said stream, which still retained its ancient name of the River of the Wells, being fed by the numerous mineral springs or wells which once made the northern environs of London watering places of high repute. As late as 1502 barges laden with fish and fuel went up the Fleet River as far as Oldbourne bridge. Strange as it seems to think of Fleet Ditch as navigable, it is still more surprising to learn that its waters were used for drinking as late as the time of Henry III., for it was not until the twenty-first year of his reign that the citizens of London were allowed to convey water from the Tyebourne in leaden pipes to the city on the express ground that the River of the Wells had become contaminated. By the end of the seventeenth century the Fleet had virtually become an open sewer, and its stench had become proverbial, as the plays of Farquhar and the poems of Swift testify.

Among the buildings of historical associations that until comparatively recent times stood on the banks of the Fleet, the most interesting was Fleet prison. Its records, like those of the river itself, go back to the time of the Conqueror, but then, as afterward, it seems to have been used, not as a veritable jail for persons accused or convicted of serious crimes, but as a house of detention for debtors (especially those indebted to the King's exchequer) and for persons guilty of minor offences. It will be remembered that Shakespeare makes the Chief Justice send Sir John Falstaff to this prison. Among the eminent persons committed to the Fleet in the sixteenth century was Miles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter, well known to students of the history of the English Bible. The extortion and cruelty to which the inmates of this place were subjected at the hands of the wardens caused several mutinies, and led to the regulation of the fees by acts of Parliament. Yet as the wardens had to pay a large sum annually for their office, they were continually evading the statutes, and in 1729 one of them was tried for murder. The Fleet prison was burned down in the great fire of 1666 and again by the Gordon rioters in 1780, but it was each time rebuilt, and the act for its demolition was not passed until 1842. Nevertheless few Londoners now know where it stood, and accordingly Mr. Ashton informs us that the Congregational Memorial Hall in Farringdon street was erected on a portion of its site. Farringdon street, it may be mentioned, is built over the lower course of the Fleet River.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (up to 1754) the Fleet, and its purlieus known as The Rules, were much resorted to by persons desiring to be married, cheaply, secretly, and speedily. The prison had its chaplain, who, of course, was authorized to perform the marriage ceremony in his chapel, provided he conformed to the statutes which (in the time of William III.) made registration and the publication by banns or the procurement of a license compulsory. But the bulk of the matrimonial business done in and around the Fleet was performed by the irregular clergymen or laymen, who paid no heed to the statutes, and were only scrupulous about wearing the cossack, gown, and bands. It was a common thing for persons walking along the adjoining streets to be accosted with the question: "Sir, will you please to walk in and be married?" One of these Fleet parsons used to make £700 a year, equal in purchasing power to £2,500 at the present day. Another used to marry from 150 to 200 couples every month. Of course, the popularity which Fleet marriages enjoyed even among persons with some pretensions to respectability arose from the fact that the laws then in force, and the customs made marriage an exceedingly protracted, elaborate, and costly ceremony.

The Early History of Chinese Art.

In these days when criticism has coped with subjects so various and by paths so diverse that it seems to have left nothing unexplored in the domain of accessible knowledge, Chinese art has had the singular fortune to escape all researches. Hitherto we have had no general ideas or particular views on the æsthetic manifestations of the Chinese genius. For forty centuries Chinese artists have felt and produced, but their history has not been even sketched in outline. Neither architecture, nor sculpture, nor painting, nor the industrial arts have been studied. Chinese ceramics alone have given rise to complete monographs and manuals. M. Paléologue, for many years Secretary to the French Embassy in Pekin, has just published a view of the general history of Chinese art in a handy volume of 300 pages, entitled *L'Art Chinois* (Paris, Quantin), which goes a long way toward filling the blank hitherto existing. This book may appear incomplete from a certain point of view, for it is by no means a manual for collectors; it is simply a study of Chinese art in its great outlines, an attempt to demonstrate its general characteristics, to note its progress and transformations, and to define its styles.

The divisions of the book are headed: Bronze, architecture, carved stone, carved wood and ivory, *pietra dura*, ceramics, glass, enamels, painting, and lacquer. The Chinese knew the art of manufacturing and decorating bronze in the most remote antiquity. This art was the spontaneous language of the archaic epochs of their history, the natural mould of their primitive thought. At the limit of the mythical era and of the positive period, that is to say, according to M. Paléologue, twenty-seven centuries before our era, the Chinese knew how to cast and chase bronze, and in the year 2220 B. C. the technique of bronze was perfected to such a degree that the Emperor Yu could have engraved on vases a figurative description of the nine provinces of his empire. Under the second dynasty, that of the Chang (1783 to 1134 B. C.), metallurgy was an advanced art; and under the third dynasty, that of the Tcheou (1134 to 255 B. C.), the Chinese artists created very fine forms and decorations. The first manifestation of Chinese art was the manufacture of sacred objects destined for the ceremonies of the national religion, which was definitely formulated in the sixth century B. C. by Confucius, who incorporated in his body of doctrine all the rites of the primitive religion. Now these rites, which regulated the primitive worship in all its details, at the same time determined the forms of the vases reserved for the accomplishment of these ceremonies, and that, too, with such minute and imperative precision that the bronzes made at the present day for official sacrifices are still composed of the same alloy, have the same contours, the same dimensions, and the same weight as those cast for the same purposes more than 2,500 years ago. M. Paléologue calls attention to the singular fate of China in this respect. At the very beginning, at that all important hour in primitive civilizations when forms and types are created, when invention is spontaneous and imagination active, Chinese æsthetic ideas were already enchained by the prescriptions of the ritual. Thus conventionality and routine, which generally appear only in the art of old nations, exhausted by too great production, or weary of a too prolonged activity, were imposed from the beginning on the Chinese artists, dispensing them from personal interpretation and from all expressive research, and constraining them to repeat faithfully and servilely types immutably fixed.

Furthermore, it was the curious fortune of China to remain for fifteen centuries closed to the rest of the world, and thus to escape those great philosophical and religious movements which renew the ideas and consciences of a people, modify its æsthetic conceptions, and more or less free it from the thraldom of its traditions. Until the introduction of Buddhism in the first century of our era, the Chinese empire presented the spectacle of a civilization without continuous contact and without intermixture with foreign civilizations. Its art during this period was stationary, unprogressive, hieratic, without liberty of inspiration, without that love of pure lines which guided the hand of the bronze and ceramic artists of Athens or of Corinth.

The introduction of the Buddhist doctrine caused a revolution in Chinese art. It gave it new forms and new ideas; it modified the artists' way of thinking and of looking at things; it gave them something of the imagination and idealism of the Aryans. With Buddhism in China appear works of a purity of outline unknown before. There is henceforward a variety of types, of elegance, of fancy, perfect skill in establishing the proportions of a vase or of a perfume holder; in short, what is called style makes its appearance in Chinese art. Furthermore, the ornamental motives are more numerous and richer. The animal and vegetable kingdoms furnish innumerable subjects, and for the first time Chinese artists treat the human figure and introduce a mystic and spiritualist element into art. M. Paléologue frequently and justly insists upon this fact that it was Buddhism which taught the Chinese to see and to comprehend nature.

Next to the Buddhist influence on Chinese art, must be noticed that of the Mohammedans. China came into relations with Islam in the seventh century A. D., but it was not until the end of the thirteenth century that the Mongolian conquest really brought China into relations with Western civilization. The first conqueror, Kubiai-Khan, grandson of Ghengis-Khan, set up his court at Pekin, as Marco Polo has described it, and surrounded himself with wise men, artists, and adventurers from all parts of the world, India, Thibet, Persia, Moscow, Poland, Hungary, Flanders, Genoa, Pisa, and Venice. The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are all important in the history of Chinese art from the point of view of the reciprocal influence which European art and Chinese art then underwent. From this epoch dates the adoption in China of a whole series of decorative forms and designs, the types of which had been created by the Persia of the Sassanidæ and later by the Arab Califates of Iran and western Asia. It seems highly probable that the Chinese learned the art of enamelling at this epoch from Western artisans. Hitherto specialists have not been very clear on this point, but M. Paléologue has brought together a selection of documents and facts that are highly significant. First of all, the Chinese name for cloisonné enamel, *fa-lan*, means Frankish enamel, Frank being an epithet which the Chinese, like all modern Asiatics, apply to everything of Western or European origin. The most ancient Chinese cloisonnés closely resemble certain enamels of the Byzantine school. How and at what epoch was the Byzantine or European art of cloisonné introduced into China? There are two hypotheses. Isolated artists travelling across Asia may have established manufactories in the great towns they visited, like those Syrian colonies that wandered and worked through France in the Merovingian times, and likewise introduced Byzantine processes. Relations between China and Europe by the overland route, Persia and Turkestan or Siberia and Mongolia were less rare in the thirteenth century than is generally believed. The Grand Khans held a court at Karakorum where all sorts of people came, including many Italian, French, and Flemish monks charged with missions from Rome. In 1251, when the monk Guillaume de Rubrouck arrived at Karakorum, the first persons he met were "Master Guillaume Boucher, goldsmith, who had lived formerly on the Grand Bridge at Paris," and "a woman of Metz in Lorraine, named Paquette, who had been made prisoner in Hungary." This Guillaume was goldsmith to the Grand Khan, who afterward became Emperor of China. At Karakorum there were also Arabs, Syrians, and Moscovites. The voyage of the father and uncle of Marco Polo in Tartary (1256) was not the first that the Venetians had attempted in search of Eastern outlets for their commerce. Artisans from Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary had also travelled to Mongolia and Cathay, carrying with them the practice of many European industries. Now, when the grand Khan moved his court from Karakorum to Pekin, all these travellers, adventurers, and artisans accompanied him, and so China was open, for a time, to outside influences. Marco Polo, it will be remembered, tells us in what high credit Europeans were held by the Mongolian Emperor, and how greatly he esteemed foreign products.

The second hypothesis is that Arabian navigators were the importers of cloisonné into China, the commerce between southern China and the world of Islam having become very important toward the fourteenth century. But on the whole the first hypothesis is the more probable. The certainty to be retained is that cloisonné is not an invention of the Chinese, but an art which they borrowed and perfected.

One of the most interesting chapters in M. Paléologue's book is that on the working of hard stones and gems, particularly jade. Jade, which the Chinese call *yu*, is a hard, heavy, translucid stone, very fine in texture, unctuous to the eye and to the touch. Its tones vary from greasy white to dark olive green, according to the proportions of oxide of iron or of oxide of chromium that it contains. Its hardness is such that it will scratch glass and quartz.

According to M. Paléologue, the principal deposits of jade are in old Chinese Turkestan, near the towns of Khotan and Yarkand, in the country called by the Chinese Yuthian, or the land of Jade. The excessive hardness of jade renders its working most difficult and tedious. An object in jade has often cost from five to six hundred days of labor. Having examined the piece of brute stone, observed its form and its irregularities, visible or probable, he tells us that the workman fashions it roughly by boring a series of juxtaposed holes with a drill or rimer, and then splitting out the intermediate portions. This operation he repeats until the object he contemplates appears in its principal contours. The decoration is wrought either by chasing and rubbing with jade stone, while the final polish is obtained with emery powder. M. Paléologue says that the jade workers use diamond-pointed drills and diamond dust. This must be an oversight on his part, or possibly due to that strange ignorance which seems to overcome many intelligent Europeans in discussing Chinese subjects. It is possible that since the Cape Diamond fields have thrown quantities of stones into the market, the Chinese may have availed themselves of this industrial commodity; but it is certainly only within recent times that the diamond has become known in China, and it can be only very recently that the jade workers have taken to using diamonds and diamond dust in their art. All old jade has been cut and wrought with astonishing and inconceivable patience, by means of small bits of bamboo bearing wetted jade dust, and operating by simple attrition. Modern objects in jade produced by the methods of Dutch lapidaries with steel tools and diamond dust, are comparatively worthless.

The Chinese consider jade to be the finest substance in which human thought can be incorporated. It is the material which they esteem most highly, and that, too, even when it takes the form of a simple unornamented plate or tally.

Now, why is this so? To speak frankly, M. Paléologue tells us, this predilection seems strange to European eyes. We may marvel at the patience of the workman, at the ingenuity with which he takes advantage of the accidents and even of the defects of the material, at the beauty and novelty of the forms of the objects he makes, but nevertheless people of ordinary culture cannot help finding rock crystal more brilliant, to say nothing of the color and iridescence of cornaline, sardonyx, onyx, and agate. The peculiar greasy aspect of jade prevents its acquiring anything more than a vague translucidity. Then why do the Chinese esteem jade so highly? Is it on account of its rarity? No; the Khotan beds have been productive during twenty-five centuries, and there are as yet no signs of their becoming exhausted. The true reasons are rather ritual and traditional than æsthetic. In remote antiquity the hardness of jade made it the imperishable substance *par excellence*, and for this reason it was used for making the most precious ritual objects, gold and silver being obtainable only in very small quantities. In the twelfth century before our era, when the form of the ritual objects was determined, *yu* or jade was prescribed for the most important, and bronze for the others. Furthermore jade has a symbolic value in the eyes of the Chinese which is thus explained by Confucius: "It is not because jade is rare that it is much esteemed, but because from ancient times the wise have compared virtue to jade. In the eyes of the wise man the polish and brilliancy of jade symbolize the virtue of humanity; its perfect compactness and its extreme hardness represent sureness of intelligence; its angles, which do not cut, although they appear trenchant, figure justice; the beads of jade, which hang from the hat and girdle, figure the ceremonial; the pure and sustained sound which it gives when struck, and which ends brusquely, is the emblem of music. Its iridescent brilliancy reminds one of the sky; its admirable substance, derived from mountains and rivers, represents the earth. This is why the wise man esteems jade."

A later Chinese writer informs us that jade represents the nine highest virtues of man. These are benevolence, indicated by its smoothness; knowledge, by its glowing polish; justice, by its inflexible solidity; virtuous activity, by its modest inoffensiveness; purity, by its rareness and spotlessness; duration, by its imperishableness; veracity, by its showing the slightest scratch; moral stamina, by its unsurpassed beauty; music, by its beautiful sound when struck. [It is remarkable that the sound vibrations of jade do not die away gradually like those of the metals, but cease abruptly.]

The objects made of jade are cups, bowls, vases, and musical instruments used in worship; ritual ornaments, insignia of the sovereign and of the functionaries of the empire; and, finally, familiar objects which correspond very closely to our modern conception of bric-à-brac, or object of art, pure and simple. The spirit in which the Chinese appreciate this third category of objects is much the same as that in which Messrs. Barbedienne, Gentien, De Semallé, Gonse, Burtz, Heber R. Bishop, Dr. Bigelow, Quincy Shaw, or W. T. Walters enjoy their precious specimens of Oriental art: it is the spirit of elevated, comprehensive, contemplative, and transcendental æsthetics. M. Paléologue has very subtly analyzed the refined epicureanism which prevailed in China about the sixth century of our era, and which, by the way, resembles in many points the epicureanism of the intelligent amateurs of modern Europe. In the sixth century after Christ, Chinese civilization had already had more than 1,600 years of historical existence, and an existence troubled by so many trials, struggles, tyrannical public misfortunes, that a sentiment of lassitude first of all, and then of melancholy resignation, had little by little taken possession of thinking minds. The influence of Buddhist beliefs favored this tendency; men no longer conceived great hopes or robust ambitions. The insignificance of life, the instability of things, the necessity of making haste to enjoy and to taste the present hour without thinking of the morrow, were the habitual themes of all discussions and the subject of all Chinese literary works.

The ideal of the powerful and cultivated was henceforward an existence where personal action and strong passion had no longer any place; where each one was conscious of the definitive uselessness of his task; where men sought, in the charm of revery, in the pleasure of conversation and literary culture, in a sort of voluptuous *insouciance*, in the pleasant intoxication of rice alcohol, forgetfulness of human miseries.

The Marquis d'Hervey de Saint-Denis has translated for the French many of the poets of the dynasty of Thang, Li-tai-pe, Thoufon, and others, who have depicted this state of mind, and whose works are a constant invitation to carelessness, to pleasure, to dreamy intoxication. The educated Chinese used to meet, therefore, to drink, and to converse, in pavilions adorned with precious objects, which were not very numerous, but of rare quality. Cup in hand, they composed short poems, written in choice language; the pencil and the quire of paper allowed them to chisel and perfect their phrase at once. These meetings were feasts for the senses as much as for the intellect, and in the ceremonial discussion the interlocutors sought not so much to convince each other as to be suave, amiable and brilliant.

Now, porcelain being unknown at this epoch—it was not discovered until about the middle of the ninth century by the ceramists of Ta-i in the province of Sse-tch'ouen—the libations were made in vases of jade. Flowers were mingled with the rice wine, and the poet Tsin-tsan said: "The perfume of these poor flowers penetrates into the cups of jade, and the autumnal wine smells sweet of them."

The pencil cases, the ink bottles, the perfume burners, the paper weights, the seals, the bouquet holders, the hand rests, all the small objects which surrounded the company were of jade. But, as M. Paléologue says, the vague translucidity of the material and the delicate work of which it is susceptible, were less the cause of its high favor than its equal purity of texture and the agreeable sensation which it produces to the touch, a sensation at once firm and velvety, a sort of caress to the fingers, as the patine of a fine bronze is a caress to the eye. Jade was a substance that procured refined sensations to these Chinese epicureans, and suggested the most graceful thoughts and the most delicate impressions. The familiar objects made of jade acquired something of the personality of the individual to whom they belonged, and who gave them to his friends as precious souvenirs. Thus Li-tai-pe makes a woman say: "These swallows of jade, ornament of my coiffure, were on my head the day I gave myself to you; I offer them to you to-day in souvenir; do not fail to wipe them often with your silken sleeve."

This spirit of refined epicureanism flourished in China just at the moment when Buddhism brought from India æsthetic conceptions of a more elevated sort, taught the Chinese to see and comprehend nature, and caused the individual sentiment to predominate in works of art over classical conventions. Thus in jade, as in bronze, were created a variety of forms borrowed from nature, and especially from the vegetable kingdom. Hence the beautiful visions of lotus flowers, of magnolias, of ferns, of mimosas, the strange shapes of dragons, of fish, and of fantastic forms, wrought not only in jade, but in quartz stones with their rich and harmonious colorations and their capricious veins that are made to play so marvellously and so unexpectedly in the compositions of the patient artist—rock crystal, amethyst, cornaline, chalcedony, heliotrope, chrysoprase, and the varieties of agate art in cameo. This art of working gems is essentially sensualist: the Chinese artist, except, of course, in making ritual and ceremonial objects, generally aimed at procuring by his works lively or refined sensations, a ravishment of the eyes, a pleasure of touch, and not at evoking that world of thoughts, emotions, and reveries which a superior æsthetic delights to reveal.

It is rather surprising that M. Paléologue has made no reference in this chapter to the collection of jade belonging to M. Barbedienne in Paris, but of course he could not be expected to know the greatest collection of the world, that of Mr. Heber R. Bishop here in New York. The objects which he cites from the collections of MM. Bing, Gentien, and Semallé are remarkable for their workmanship rather than their quality—that is their quality as the Chinese understand it. As a rule the Chinese have avoided working fine jade into complicated forms, the beauty and purity of the matter itself being considered a sufficient joy to the eye and the touch. The pieces of complicated workmanship are very often made of impure jade full of accidents and irregularities of clouding and veining. In reality the Chinese themselves have been willing to pay such enormous prices for what they consider fine jade that little of it has come to Europe or America. The supremely fine jade—from the Chinese point of view—that has come to Europe is that which was taken at the sacking of the summer palace. Of this lot there are some pieces at Fontainebleau, about twenty pieces in the Barbedienne collection, and one or two pieces in the Walters collection. Most of this jade was brought to France by one of Palikao's officers, M. Negroni, at whose sale M. Barbedienne bought his finest pieces.

We should add that in the collection of Mr. Bishop there are over two hundred and fifty pieces, several of them from fifteen to twenty inches high. Every period is represented, from the nineteenth century back to the twelfth. There are specimens, not only from China, but also from Burmah, Siberia, New Zealand, Turkestan, India, Switzerland, Alaska, and British Columbia. Between fifteen and twenty objects of the most important character are from the sacking of the Summer Palace. Not less than twenty pieces are of the beautiful Foi-tsue. One large green cylindrical vase, 8 inches high by 8½ inches diameter, and beautifully cut in landscape and other subjects, came from the collection of Albert Heard, Esq. It was presented to him while residing in China by Col. Schmidt, Chief of Staff to Count Palikao. Col. Schmidt personally took this vase from the bedroom of the Emperor in the Summer Palace. There is also a white jade slab upon which is cut a picture of the Summer Palace, showing the building and garden. There is also a sage green bowl from India, cut prior to 1770, which a merchant of India presented to the Emperor Kien Lung. It is of a beautiful and very graceful design. The Emperor was so much pleased that he had engraved upon it a poem, which he therein states was composed by himself. This bowl likewise came from the sacking of the Summer Palace.

The merits of M. Paléologue's book are that he has attempted to define the characteristics of the æsthetic imagination and of the plastic sense of the Chinese; he has sought to explain the artistic form with which they clothed their religious thought, the ideal of sensuous beauty that Buddhism revealed to them, the sentiment with which nature inspired them, and the manner in which they interpreted it. Another point which dominates this volume, and which the author has illustrated by a great number of examples and documents, is the historical evolution of art in China placed in contact with foreign civilizations. Contrary to a generally received opinion, M. Paléologue has come to the conviction that China has not remained immovable during centuries and closed to the outer world, but that powerful influences from without have insensibly modified its traditions and transformed the conceptions of its artists. These grand currents of influence have come, he thinks, each in its turn, from Chaldea and Assyria, so far as concerns architecture, from India through Buddhism, from the Roman empire, from Arabia, from Persia, and from Europe.

Not to be Forgotten.

The poems of the late Henry William Herbert, better known as *Frank Forester*, have been collected and edited by Mr. Morgan Herbert and published in a volume of unusual elegance (John Wiley & Sons).

The author of these poems was much more famous in his day as a writer of books on horses and sport than as a literary and imaginative author. His philological learning was extensive and accurate. He was the master of an unaffected, vigorous, manly, and impressive style, and his acquaintance with English and ancient history, and with the technical topics on which he was most accustomed to write, was solid and practical. To those who knew him best and esteemed most cordially the generous qualities of his character, this collection of his poems will be a welcome possession, and we are much indebted to the editor for the industry and faithfulness he has employed in making it. Out of nearly a hundred compositions in the volume, a considerable number are translations from the Greek tragic poets. Herbert cultivated the classics with a sincere and intelligent love, and some of his best pages are drawn from that source. It is all of the old school of poetry, the school which prevailed before Tennyson was born; and it reminds us more of the productions of Campbell than of any later English verse maker. But it is all masculine and substantial, and it will be treasured by all those friends of Herbert who still remain. As a specimen, we transcribe the following ballad:

MARGARET.

It was wild and winter night, cold the wind was blowing;
Not as yet i' the lonely farm was the red cock crowing;
Only from the reedy fen came the bittern's booming,
Long before the misty morn in the east was glooming.

Long before the misty morn in the east was breaking;
Only on the moorland dun was the hill fox waking;
Only from the ivied holt sad the owls were hooting,
And the gusty skies along falling stars were shooting.

Only from the gusty skies falling stars were gleaming,
Not a light from lordly tower or lowly hut was beaming;
Only o'er the green morass meteors pale were creeping—
Yet was Margaret awake, all awake and weeping.

Early Margaret was awake, early awake and sighing,
For how could she lie warm asleep, when he lay cold and dying?
There was a terror in her ear as of a bell slow ringing,
A deep, dull toll, though toll was none, upon the night wind swinging.

A heavy terror at her heart, strange shapes around her wheeling,
A steed all blood, a saddle bare, a dark rout blindly reeling;
Sad Margaret, she only heard that bell's unearthly tolling;
Pale Margaret, she only saw the red tide round her rolling.

Yet now there came, when lulled the wind, a sound of war steeds stamping
Adown the hill, along the fen, across the bridge slow tramping;
And now there came amid the gloom the flash of torches glancing,
And harness bright, and lance heads light, and plumes and pennons dancing.

It was wild and winter night, cold the wind was blowing;
Not as yet in the lonely farm was the red cock crowing;
It was wild and winter night, all but she were sleeping
When the war cry broke above them, changed their rest to weeping.

Only from the reedy fen came the bittern's booming
Long before the misty morn in the east was glooming;
When the sullen cloud of smoke, o'er the roofs [illegible] sailing,
Changed their brief and bootless strife into endless wailing.

Sad Margaret, she only waked when all the rest were sleeping;
Pale Margaret, she only smiled when all the rest were weeping;
True Margaret, she only said, "I care not, though he slay me;"
She only said, "I care not, but near his cold corpse lay me."

Brave Margaret, she only said when flashed the broadsword o'er her—
She only said, "I care not," when her life blood streamed before her.
She only said, as ebbed her life, "This is the end of sorrow;
For I shall be with him," she said, "with him and my God to-morrow."

BOOK NOTES.

"The Manual of the White Cross," edited by the Rev. B. F. De Costa (E. P. Dutton & Co.), is a brief account of the Society of the White Cross, established a few years ago for the purpose of encouraging the maintenance of that purity required by the Gospel. It contains all that is essential to be known by persons desiring to join the society.

Dr. E. L. Macomb Bristol, author of "A Story of the Sands and Other Poems" (Brentano's), calls himself, or some injudicious admirer has called him, "the Flower Poet." He writes a good deal about flowers, to be sure, but can lay little claim to the title of poet. There is no original thought in his verses, and of the laws of metre he seems to possess a very imperfect knowledge.

Samuel Benner, an Ohio farmer, is the author of "Benner's Prophecies, or Future Ups and Downs in Prices," of which Robert Clarke & Co. have just issued the fourth edition. Mr. Benner, in a previous edition of his work, made a few lucky guesses, on the strength of which he has gained some reputation with credulous people. It is even said that a veteran operator in Wall street has taken considerable pains to circulate these "Prophecies," averring that any one who trusts to them and buys and lays away stocks at present prices will eventually profit largely by the transaction.

We have received from Scribner & Welford volume II. of "The Henry Irving Shakespeare," to the peculiar plan of which, making it a unique work, we have already referred with hearty approval. It contains five plays, the second and third parts of "King Henry VI.," the "Taming of the Shrew," "A Midsummer Night's Dream," and "King Richard II.," and what will prove of lively interest to students of dramatic literature, Charles Kemble's condensation of the three parts of "Henry VI." into one play, printed from Kemble's MS. in Mr. Irving's possession, and now for the first time made public. The introductions and notes by Mr. Frank A. Marshall, upon whom, as in the previous volume, the chief editorial labor seems to have devolved, are eminently to the point, and some of them will be found entirely new.

"The Truth About Tristrem Varick," by Edgar Saltus (Belford, Clark & Co.), has this advantage over his "Mr. Incoul's Misadventure," that its denouement is neither monstrous nor incoherent, but passably natural, considering the circumstances by which the hero is confronted. It is nevertheless a disagreeable, not to say a nasty story, to which, however, the author's skill in analyzing character and masking the more repulsive features of his plot has communicated an undeniable interest. If, as is claimed, he is a student and imitator of Balzac, it must be said that the volume before us falls short of the analytic grasp and morbid coloring of his master. It is a story of retributive revenge, prompted by such motives only as would inspire a naturally amiable man, whom cruel wrongs have temporarily thrown off his balance and converted into a crank. At the same time we are inclined to believe that such vicious characters as are repeatedly introduced are exceedingly uncommon in New York or anywhere else, even if their scarcity should prevent Mr. Saltus from constructing another unwholesome novel after the Balzac pattern. The author occasionally expresses himself in very bad English.